

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 9-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 6-8 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 21 and 22 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5, 9, 10 and 13-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyon (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0072108 A1, hereinafter “Hyon”) in view of Torek, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,599,683 B1, hereinafter “Torek”) and Liu, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,114,099, hereinafter “Liu”). Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected in view of these references in combination with other references. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As a preliminary note, the material added by previous amendment has been removed from claims 1 and 16 in view of the Examiner's continued rejection of the claims. This material has now been added in newly provided claims 21 and 22, which recite that the cationic surfactant is selected from the group consisting of DTAB and TTAB. Arguments related to this limitation in the earlier amendment now apply to claims 21 and 22 rather than claims 1 and 16.

Looking to the presently pending claims, claim 1, as amended, specifically recites "applying a cationic surfactant to the patterned resist film thereby forming a salt with negatively charged groups on a sidewall of the patterned resist film." Support for this additional material can be found, for example, on page 15, lines 1 to 2. None of the references of record teach or suggest a surfactant that forms a salt with the negatively charged groups on the sidewall of the resist web. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 2-5, 9-15 and 22 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 16, as amended, specifically recites "exposing the patterned resist layer to a cationic surfactant thereby forming a salt with negatively charged groups on a sidewall of the patterned resist layer." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the references of record do not teach or suggest forming a salt with negatively charged groups on a sidewall of the patterned resist layer. Therefore, claim 16 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 17-21 depend from claim 16 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, in the event that there are any fees due, please charge the same, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

June 12, 2007  
Date

/Ira S. Matsil/  
Ira S. Matsil  
Reg. No. 35,272  
Attorney for Applicant

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, TX 75252  
Tel: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218